

Grammatical model of text analysis in the translation practice of Jerome of Stridon

Damian Sochacki OCD

(summary of doctoral thesis)

In this dissertation, the author attempts to demonstrate and defend Jerome's extensive competence in Greco-Roman grammar and Hebrew. In order to present the arguments, the author uses the Hellenistic model of textual analysis of Dionysius Thrax, which was adapted and condensed by Marcus Terentius Varro into a four-part grammatical procedure (*lectio, enarratio, emendatio, iudicium*). Using the example of an analysis of the passages of the commentary on the Book of Jeremiah, the author of the paper shows the dependence of Jerome's working model on the aforementioned grammatical model of Varro, which the Stridonian had learnt at the school of Donatus.

In the introduction, the author first outlines the history of the critical view of Jerome's competence and decides to enter into a discussion with the authors who most vehemently question the skills of the monk from Bethlehem (James Barr, Eitan Burstein, Neil Adkin, Pierre Nautin). The most radical view of Jerome's deficiency of linguistic tools in Hebrew is presented by Pierre Nautin, who accuses the Stridonian of a plagiarism (not only trying to prove, by citing older studies, the dependence of the commentaries on earlier authors, but also questioning his Hebraic contacts and sources) and a competenceless fantasy (where he did not use sources).

In the first chapter, the author describes the cultural and social framework of Jerome's life and scholarly work, conducting a critique of his sources of knowledge of Hebrew language and culture. In this part of the work, the influence of external sources such as the commentaries of Origen and Eusebius, the Greek reviews of the Old Testament contained in the Hexapla or, finally, personal encounters with Hebrew teachers is highlighted. Awareness of all these sources of knowledge on the one hand confirms the supposition of borrowed expertise from earlier ecclesiastical writers, while on the other hand argues for direct encounters with Hebrew scholars of his time and the acquisition of active competence in consultation with them.

In chapter two, the author of this work presents the pillars of Jerome's Roman education and its manifestations in his work on the translation of the Old Testament. The reconstruction of the educational process leads to a sharpening of the influence of one of the greatest teachers of grammar in late antiquity, Aelius Donatus, and his student Servius, on Jerome's philological work. Varro's adapted model of textual analysis was used in the school of Aelius Donatus to illustrate grammatical issues. Through the four-part analysis of passages of poetry and prose at

the grammarian's school, Jerome learnt professional textual analysis, which he used in his translation and exegetical work especially of the Old Testament.

In the third chapter, the author attempts to demonstrate, using the example of passages from the Commentary on the Book of Jeremiah, Jerome's dependence in his work with the Hebrew text on the aforementioned Greco-Roman model of textual analysis. In this way, the author of the paper joins the discussion and defends Jerome's competence in Hebrew philology in the broadest sense. The author also seeks to answer the question, or are we dealing with a change in Jerome's hermeneutical option (from *graeca veritas* to *hebraica veritas*) and a search for factual literalism, a historical context appropriate to the so-called School of Antioch?

A comparison of the four-part model (*lectio, enarratio, emendatio, iudicium*) with Jerome's mode of working on the text of the Book of Jeremiah raises a variety of arguments in defence of his high competence within the Hebrew language. Grammatical and cultural commentaries (dealing with three languages and cultural circles at once) are scattered throughout the corpus of Jerome's works, which is extensive, comprising the 8th volumes of the J. P. Migne edition (12,000 pages). Only looking at the whole gives a true picture of Jerome's broad horizons and high competence within the three languages and cultures of the Mediterranean.

The author of the work finally addresses the question posed in the course of his research on Jerome's mode of translation and interpretation in chapter three and concludes that the life of this great philologist can be divided into two stages: (1) a fascination with the Greek Christian heritage and (2) a conviction for the so-called Hebrew truth (*hebraica veritas*). In the first stage, Jerome, as a young graduate of the Roman schools, visited the Greek-speaking centres of Christian thought in order to listen to the masters, who used, above all, a colourful and interesting allegorical. Thus Jerome listened to Apollonius of Laodicea while training his knowledge of the Greek language, marvelled at Gregory of Nazianzus when visiting Constantinople and boasted of having stayed for a month at the feet of Didymos of Alexandria. The situation was reversed for two reasons: firstly, the writings of Origen had become dangerous, and Jerome was, after all, using them handfully; secondly, our monk's sojourn in Antioch, then in the desert in Syria and finally in Palestine opened him up to a new method of interpreting the text that put the literal sense and its historical-cultural context first.